

REMARKS

In an Office Action mailed October 22, 2007, claims 1-17 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,236,847 (Stikvoort), and claims 21-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 7,251,298 (Hietala) in view of Stikvoort. In response thereto, Applicant amends claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 16, 17, 21, 23, and 33 and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-17 and 19-38 and the allowance thereof, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance.

102 Rejection

Claims 1-17 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Stikvoort. Note however that as amended, claim 1 recites that “one of said first and second filter sections has at least three polyphase filter stages, and wherein resistances of resistors of each preceding stage of said at least three polyphase filter stages are related to resistances of corresponding resistors of a succeeding stage of said at least three polyphase filter stages by a predetermined ratio.” This limitation is not shown or suggested by Stikvoort.

Note that Stikvoort does not appear to disclose the sizes of resistors in succeeding stages at all. Moreover, no prior art of record, to the extent understood by Applicant, discloses a polyphase filter having multiple sections separated by a buffer in which one section has at least three stages in which resistors in each succeeding stage are related to corresponding resistors in a prior stage by a predetermined ratio. Such a filter provides a substantially flat passband response without adding significant circuit area. See paragraphs [0037] and [0038].

Likewise, Stikvoort does not show or suggest a polyphase filter having at least four polyphase filter stages, in which “at least three polyphase filter stages are coupled together without an intervening buffer, and wherein resistances of resistors of each preceding stage of said at least three polyphase filter stages are related to resistances of corresponding resistors of a succeeding stage of said at least three polyphase filter stages by a predetermined ratio” as recited in claim 10, or a method comprising a step of “filtering said signals successively in a polyphase filter having first and second polyphase filter sections . . . wherein one of said first and second polyphase filter sections has at least three polyphase filter stages, and wherein resistances of

resistors of each preceding stage of said at least three polyphase filter stages are related to resistances of corresponding resistors of a succeeding stage of said at least three polyphase filter stages by a predetermined ratio” as recited in claim 16.

Claims 2-9, 11-15, 17, and 19-20 are likewise not shown or suggested by Stikvoort for at least the same reasons that their respective base claims are not.

103 Rejections

Claims 21-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 7,251,298 (Hietala) in view of Stikvoort. Applicants note that the Examiner cited Hietala for details of a receiver rather than a polyphase filter used in a receiver. Thus Applicant notes that Stikvoort (and Hietala in view of Stikvoort) does not show or suggest a receiver comprising a polyphase filter having first and second filter sections, “wherein one of said first and second polyphase filter sections has at least three polyphase filter stages, and wherein resistances of resistors of each preceding stage of said at least three polyphase filter stages are related to resistances of corresponding resistors of a succeeding stage of said at least three polyphase filter stages by a predetermined ratio” as recited in claim 21, or a receiver comprising a second mixer with a polyphase filter having first and second polyphase filter sections, “wherein one of said first and second polyphase filter sections has at least three polyphase filter stages, and wherein resistances of resistors of each preceding stage of said at least three polyphase filter stages are related to resistances of corresponding resistors of a succeeding stage of said at least three polyphase filter stages by a predetermined ratio” as recited in claim 33.

Claims 22-32 and 34-38 are likewise not rendered obvious by Hietala in view of Stikvoort for at least the same reasons that their respective base claims are not.

CONCLUSION

Thus Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-17 and 19-38 are allowable over the prior art of record for the reasons more particularly set forth above. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of the rejection of the pending claims and the allowance thereof, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance. If the Examiner is unable to issue a Notice of Allowance at the next communication and believes that a telephone interview would be appropriate, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney at the phone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

Paul J. Polansky; Reg. No. 33,992
Attorney for Applicant(s)
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP
5914 West Courtyard Drive, Ste. 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)